

REMARKS

By this Amendment, claims 1 and 9 are amended, and claims 10 and 15 are canceled, without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11, 13 and 14 are pending in this application. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

I. Request for Interview

Applicants respectfully request a personal interview with the Examiner to assist the Examiner's understanding of Applicants' response to the Office Action and to advance prosecution by resolving any remaining issues. Therefore, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned to indicate his availability for a personal interview.

II. Formal Matters

The Office Action objects to claims 9 and 10 for informalities. Claim 9 is amended to obviate the objection. Claim 10 is canceled, and the features of claim 10 are incorporated into claim 1 with the objected-to language being corrected to obviate the objection. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action objects to claim 10 as being in improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicants respectfully traverse this objection.

Canceled claim 10 recited a sensing unit and a control unit that were not in its base claim 1. Therefore, claim 10 does further limit the subject matter of claim 1. However, because the features of claim 10 are incorporated into claim 1, this objection is moot. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

III. The Pending Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claim 1, 2, 5 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Design Patent No. D443,230 to DaRosa. This rejection is moot with respect to canceled claim 15 and is respectfully traversed with respect to the remaining claims.

Claim 1 is amended to incorporate the features of canceled claim 10, which is not included in this rejection. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over DaRosa. Claims 2 and 5 are patentable at least for their dependence on claim 1, as well as for the additional features they recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claim 1, 2, 5, 11 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 6,676,050 to Chang. This rejection is moot with respect to canceled claim 15 and is respectfully traversed with respect to the remaining claims.

As discussed above, claim 1 is amended to incorporate the features of canceled claim 10, which is not included in this rejection. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over Chang. Claims 2, 5 and 11 are patentable at least for their dependence on claim 1, as well as for the additional features they recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 4, 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Chang in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,931,770 to Abramson and U.S. Patent No. 4,879,724 to Matsumoto et al. (Matsumoto). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Abramson and Matsumoto do not overcome the deficiency of Chang with respect to claim 1. Therefore, claims 4, 8 and 9 are patentable at least for their dependence on claim 1, as well as for the additional features they recite. As such, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claim 1, 2, 5, 6 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 4,192,467 to Hatanaka, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,100,804 to Brady et al.

(Brady). This rejection is moot with respect to canceled claim 15 and is respectfully traversed with respect to the remaining claims.

As discussed above, claim 1 is amended to incorporate the features of canceled claim 10, which is not included in this rejection. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over the applied references. Claims 2, 5 and 6 are patentable at least for their dependence on claim 1, as well as for the additional features they recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 4 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hatanaka in view of Brady. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 4 and 7 are patentable at least for their dependence on claim 1, as well as for the additional features they recite. As such, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Chang in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,758,392 to Bennett et al. (Bennett). This rejection is moot with respect to canceled claim 10, but is respectfully traversed with respect to claim 1 that now recites the features of claims 10 and 15.

Claim 1 recites that the image display member comprises paper. As alleged by the Patent Office in the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection over Chang, Chang is directed to breaking a compact disc (CD). In addition, as alleged by the Patent Office in the current rejection, Bennett discloses a credit card destruction system. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Chang nor Bennett teaches the image display member comprising paper, as recited in claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is patentably distinct from the applied references. As such, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over DaRosa in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,038,012 to Bley. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Bley does not overcome the deficiency of DaRosa with respect to claim 1. Therefore, claims 13 and 14 are patentable at least for their dependence on claim 1, as well as for the additional features they recite. As such, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the application are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Klifton L. Kime
Registration No. 42,733

JAO:KXH/tbh

Attachment:

Request for Continued Examination

Date: December 20, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--